The Discrepancies the Jury Overlooked in Convicting Hiss, by Vern Countryman, See Page 2

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 20 MAY 20, 1957 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

# The Mind of Nikita Krushchev

Thoughtful intellectuals on the Left would do well to study carefully the text of the interview Krushchev gave Turner Catledge of the *New York Times* (May 11). The interview shows a man of great shrewdness, with a peasant's vividness of speech, but with an outlook on society not very different from Stalin's.

Earlier Marxists saw the dictatorship of the proletariat as a painful temporary necessity, but this man's world, like Stalin's, is a simple world of blacks and whites, in which those at the top decide which is which. Censorship, in this view, is as Krushchev told Catledge a "rational use of a means at the disposal of society not to waste . . . ink, paper and paste on information that only creates harm." The permanent censorship has been the ideal of the closed society since Plato.

Krushchev said that as Marxism Leninism grew more "fashionable", it would become more important to oppose "pseudo-Communists" in order to "keep the theory clean." The metaphor with which he tried to explain was revealing. "We can compare it to the Army," Krushchev said. "When a company is marching all in step except one man he should try to keep step or . . . drop somewhere in the tail until he learns to march correctly." That was also the way the cult of the individual and all the terrible abuses connected with it happened. Men were taught they all had to march as one; to keep step. Between the censored press and the regimented people none dared question Stalin.

## Just A CIA Fabrication

How could such a man have downgraded Stalin? It is clear that Krushchev hated Stalin. It is not clear that he hates Stalinism. Indeed it has been clear for some time that he has begun to regret that attack on Stalin and is anxious to rehabilitate the dictator in order to reconstruct the shaky foundations of the dictatorship. He is getting ready to deny that he ever spoke at all. "I don't know what you mean by the text of my speech," Krushchev said when Catledge referred to it. "There was a text apparently fabricated by the U.S. intelligence service. But this publishing house, headed by Allen Dulles, has no great standing in our eyes."

This is the Bare-Faced Super-Whopper. Krushchev does not yet dare deny that he attacked Stalin. Too many millions know that he did. He does not say, as an honest man might, that the published text was wrong in this respect or that. It is all a fabrication by the CIA.

Stalin was a very great man, so Krushchev now says, though admitting his faults were considerable. But when Catledge asked what these were, Krushchev said they were the faults mentioned in Lenin's testament. But these were all personal faults. Here is the leading figure of the most important Marxist country in the world, where dialectical materialism is gospel, and he attributes all the failings of several decades to one man's personality defects. Is this Marxism?

Krushchev did say it is "impossible for one man or one party to exercise the exclusive right to interpret Marxism and Leninism." He speaks of a "collective interpretation." But how does this arise in the absence of free discussion? Where does this collective consciousness, like the *sobornost* of Orthodox Russian theology, lie? In the magic of some new communion, in some new priesthood? Is this not mysticism? Is it not nonsense, the nonsense of a self-deifying bureaucracy?

## Not Marx's Marxism

Lenin, though wiser and kinder, was also in some respects as simple-minded. But this is not socialism as it was envisaged by Marx and Engels. They saw in it a more perfect democracy, not rule from the top by a self-chosen few. Marx and Engels would never recognize a Marxism that purported to be a self-contained system embracing the totality of truth, from which correct answers could be obtained on any subject by turning on the top spigots in the hierarchy. This rigid, naive, dogmatic view is the very opposite of that rich, complex and dynamic concept of social change which Marx and Engels developed in the tradition of English philosophical materialism.

The Krushchev mentality is the mentality which—as Tito revealed—thought Rakosi an "honest revolutionist" as easily imposed on Budapest as flim-flam is imposed on Moscow. With this mentality in command, one can expect further eruptions in Eastern Europe and ultimately in Russia itself, and one can expect the further degeneration of the world Communist movement as it dutifully swallows Krushchev's new CIA whopper, as it once swallowed Stalin's assurance that Lenin's Testament was only a Trotskyite invention.

When the Continental Congress in 1774 tried to win Canada to the revolutionary struggle against England, it explained in a *Letter to the Inhabitants of Quebec* why certain rights were being insisted upon. Of freedom of the press, it said that this was a means "whereby oppressive officers are shamed or intimidated into more honorable and just modes of conducting affairs." Two centuries later this takes on new meaning in the struggle against Stalinism. If freedom of the press had not been so completely crushed by Lenin and Trotsky at the very beginning of the Bolshevik revolution, Stalinism would never have come into being. It is not in censorship, or in dogma handed down from above, in a continued goose-step, that Russia and East Europe can avoid the evils Krushchev himself exposed last year.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Our Reviewer Says Judge Goddard Should Have Granted A Hearing on the Motion for Retrial**

# The Discrepancies the Jury Overlooked in Convicting Hiss

**By Vern Countryman**

*Vern Countryman, formerly of Yale Law School, now practicing in Washington, is the author of a well known book on the Little Un-American Activities Committee in the State of Washington, and has reviewed the record of the Hiss case and previous books on it.—IFS.*

*Alger Hiss, In The Court of Public Opinion* is Alger Hiss's version of the case which originated with the 1948 testimony of Whittaker Chambers before the House Un-American Activities Committee and led to Hiss's 1950 conviction of perjury in denying Chambers' charges of espionage. The book contains no significant new facts, but it does contain a remarkably dispassionate account of the facts.

The jury, if it followed the court's instructions, concluded that it had no reasonable doubt as to the truth of Chambers' espionage story despite the fact that Chambers himself had twice earlier denied under oath that any espionage was involved and despite some startling features of the Chambers testimony including:

## Some Major Discrepancies

(1) Chambers told the House Committee of numerous visits to four successive Hiss residences from 1934 to 1937 but could remember virtually nothing about the houses. After spending three months with the FBI, which had acquired floor plans of the houses and which brought in former maids of the Hisses for Chambers to interrogate, he was able at the trial to testify to almost complete floor plans. Mrs. Chambers supplied supporting details.

(2) Chambers told the House Committee he had spent several nights at one of the Hiss residences. Thereafter, Hiss's former maid told him that the house had only two bedrooms, both occupied by the Hiss family. At the trial Chambers disclaimed any recollection of an overnight visit.

(3) Mrs. Chambers' description of one of the Hiss residences which she claimed to have visited in 1937 or 1938 removed a tree and replaced it with a concrete porch—a physical alteration which did not actually take place until 1946.

(4) One of the documents which Chambers claimed Hiss had given him for transmission to Russian agents summarized part of a State Department cable reporting on French neutrality in the Sino-Japanese hostilities of 1938, but omitted another part commenting on Japanese plans for a military move against Russia.

## The Book's Weakest Point

Hiss is quite probably correct in his assertion that the House Commitee had created an atmosphere in which the jury expected Hiss to disprove, rather than Chambers to prove, the Chambers story. But Hiss's real complaint here is against a defect inherent in the jury system, as compounded by an irresponsible Congressional committee. The weakest part of the book is the chapter devoted to criticism of the appellate court which refused to reverse the conviction. As Hiss recognizes, the jury's determination as to the credibility of witnesses is not subject to review on appeal. With this issue foreclosed, the points raised on Hiss's appeal were not such as clearly to require reversal.

Hiss has a much more legitimate complaint against the trial judge's denial of his motion for new trial which presented newly-discovered evidence on three significant points:

(1) Before the House Committee Chambers repeatedly fixed the date of his break with the Communist Party as some time in 1937. But when he later produced copies of State Department documents which he said he received from Hiss they all bore dates between January 5 and April 1, 1938. At the trial Chambers fixed the date of his break with the Party precisely at April 15, 1938 and added that "about a month" thereafter he obtained employment with the Oxford University Press translating a book and spent a further month in May and June doing the translation. Documentary evidence from the files of the Oxford Press shows that it shipped manuscript to Chambers on March 18 and that Chambers returned 100 pages of translation on May 1.

(2) Hiss's attorneys had produced at the trial a Woodstock typewriter as one which Hiss had owned until 1937 or 1938 and which the attorneys had traced to a subsequent owner. A Government expert testified that the documents which Chambers claimed to have received from Hiss and other papers admittedly typed on the Hiss Woodstock came from the same machine. After Hiss's conviction his attorneys retained a specialist who, working entirely from typing samples, produced a duplicate machine which experts swore was so exact that an expert witness would not distinguish between the products of the two machines.

## Contradictions Might Have Been Resolved

(3) Affidavits of other experts showed that the machine located by the defense and placed in evidence was itself a manufactured duplicate. The distinguishing defects in the typeface were not the result of original casting or of wear, but were the product of "deliberate alteration" which left visible tool marks. Moreover, most of the typefaces were soldered on in amateurish fashion and with a different type of solder than that on the remaining typefaces. Efforts to corroborate this showing, by demonstrating that the machine in evidence was manufactured several months after the original Hiss machine was purchased and that the altered typefaces were of a different vintage than either machine, were frustrated when Woodstock officials and investigators retained by Hiss refused to sign affidavits. In this connection a hearing was requested in which they could be required to testify.

The trial judge denied both the hearing and the motion because the new arguments involved "many improbabilities." By this ruling Hiss was denied his first and best opportunity to prove his claim, made at the time of sentencing, that he is a victim of "forgery by typewriter." Hiss asserts that he is still "certain of eventual vindication." If he is indeed innocent it is a matter not only of essential justice but of considerable public importance that he have his vindication, since a conviction based on "forgery by typewriter" could hardly have been obtained without the connivance, or at least the culpable acquiescence, of prosecuting authorities. It is doubtful that justice or the public interest were best served by the ruling which deprived him of the subpoena power and left him to seek vindication "in the court of public opinion."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# "Modern Republicanism" Turns Out To Be A Blank Check for the Military

That Presidential broadcast on the budget was an inane piece of copy, about on a level with its schoolboy delivery. Ike has neither FDR's magic nor Truman's earthiness; he's too honest for the kind of demagogy needed to sell the mounting arms race as "a fight for peace" (how Orwell would have appreciated that euphemism) but too weak to hold back the military juggernaut rolling along on its own mindless momentum. The result is that Ike, who began as the instrument of the big business men who wanted to put a bridle on the military and cut the budget, has become the instrument of the Pentagon. The paradox of the growing party split is that the liberal "modern" Republicans find themselves supporting a blank check for the military.

The wickedest thing in the copy the President read was the suggestion that the Russians might unleash nuclear war if they thought they could "destroy the free world" without destroying themselves. Both sides now know that nuclear war is impossible, but the U.S. is using the economic pressure of the arms race to put the squeeze on Moscow for surrender on outstanding issues, above all German reunification on Western terms. The will of the wisp that is leading the world ever nearer to circumstances in which accident might set off a final conflict is the "brinksmanship" which Dulles prefers to diplomacy. The President says he sees no immediate prospect of relaxation. If he wanted to be candid, he might have added that the military feared relaxation.

The military are pressing now to give atomic arms to Korea. This proposal has been blocked for months in the National Security Council. It is one thing to give the Koreans "new model" arms; it is another to give them atomic arms. The Soviet bloc will follow suit, and then the two big powers will be at the mercy of the most reckless, bloodthirsty and irresponsible of all their satellites. The big argument, oddly enough, is economic. The nuclear stockpiles are so huge we can afford to spread the stuff. This is the meaning of Secretary of the Army Brucker's little noticed speech in Chicago May 7 declaring that the comparative cost of atomic arms has "declined to such an extent" that "the economics of the situation" could force us to use them "in preference to more conventional weapons." The fight over the military budget is the nearest thing this country has seen in many months to a fight for peace. The military are out to heighten tension in order to maintain political control and high spending at home. All the disarmament talk is just a smoke-screen for this basic strategy.

# Two New Liberal Senators Provide A Contrast in The McLeod Fight

Two new liberal Senators distinguished themselves in the debate over the McLeod appointment as Ambassador to Ireland, Joseph Clark, D., of Pennsylvania, for his eloquence in leading the fight against McLeod, Jacob K. Javits, R., of New York for abandoning what we thought were his principles. Senator Clark rightly declared that the nomination raised a moral issue, that McLeod's role as a McCarthyite snooper in the State Department made the vote "a clear-cut question of whether the Senate of the United States is going to turn its back on an unsavory chapter in the recent history of the United States, or whether we are going to carry forward that chapter by confirming a man whose public activities over the past four years have identified him with a philosophy of government which is alien to the highest ideals of the American people." Javits, who was himself a target of the witch hunters on the eve of his election, supported McLeod on the lame excuse that the vote was a question of confidence in the President.

McLeod's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was shifty and disingenuous, notably in discussing his rather sneaky role in the fight against Bohlen. The part McLeod played in undermining the morale of the Foreign Service makes particularly reprehensible the votes cast for him by two Senators fresh from the Foreign Service, Thruston B. Morton and John Sherman Cooper, both of Kentucky. It was also disappointing that Case of New Jersey, Flanders of Vermont, and Chavez of New Mexico should all vote for this witch hunter though they have all fought the witch hunt. Mike Mansfield, who seems to have been corrupted by association in the party leadership with Lyndon Johnson, also voted for McLeod. Incidentally Mansfield seems to have been the only Senator of Irish-American origin * to vote for McLeod. Kennedy, McNamara, Monroney, and O'Mahoney voted against him, Neely would have voted "Nay." From the South, Hill and Sparkman of Alabama, Fulbright of Arkansas, the new Senator Yarborough from Texas, and Ervin of North Carolina voted against McLeod, while Scott of North Carolina was paired against him. The others who voted against the confirmation, all Democrats, were Carroll (Col.), Church (Idaho), Douglas (Ill.), Green (R.I.), Hennings (Mo.), Jackson (Wash.)., Lausche (Ohio), Magnuson (Wash.), Morse (Ore.), Neuberger (Ore.), and Pastore (R.I.) Kefauver, Clark and Symington were paired against the nomination.

## Arthur Miller's Own Crucible

**Arthur Miller's trial for contempt was still going on as we went to press. It was painful to hear his lawyer, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., expatiate on the fact that Miller had been a "cooperative and forthright witness" with "no desire to show up the committee." A man who wrote a play against the witch hunt ought not to crawl before it. Rauh's pleadings, like Miller's appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee, does not challenge the right of Congress to engage in ideological inquisition. In the Miller case, as in Watkins, Rauh is only defending unwillingness to inform on others. But if Congress has a right to explore men's political views and associations, how can an individual witness refuse to testify about his own and other's? Where no firm line of principle is drawn, no firm defense is possible. All that ugly regurgitation of hearsay and slander from the House Committee files to which Miller was subjected derives from the existence of a Congressional Inquisition. Miller betrayed himself when he was "cooperative." We had a right to expect more from the author of "The Crucible."**

*** Our favorite comment turned up in a canvass of 1,000 residents in the predominantly Irish district of the Lower Manhattan Republican Club, "Why stick Ireland with this guy?" The Club's executive committee was unanimous against McLeod and its canvass showed the district 12-1 against him. Con. Rec. May 8, P. 5836.**



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Why the Government Dropped the Ben Gold Taft-Hartley Oath Prosecution

That was a lame excuse the government gave for dropping the Ben Gold case on the eve of its scheduled retrial. The U.S. Attorney, in asking Federal Judge Curran to dismiss the indictment, said that Louis Budenz would be unable to testify at a new trial because of a heart attack and that the Justice Department had reason to believe that Benjamin Gitlow would refuse to testify again.

But the evidence they gave is as replaceable as interchangeable parts in factory production. Budenz did not claim ever to have seen or talked with Gold; Gitlow last saw Gold in June, 1929. The kind of "evidence" they furnished can be supplied by any of the other ex-Communists whom the government employes to testify.

Indeed, this was the weakness of the case. Gold was found guilty of falsely swearing in a Taft-Hartley affidavit that he was no longer a member of the Communist party. But the government produced no witnesses to testify that he still paid dues, attended meetings, or carried out party directives after filing his affidavit. All it really had was surmise by its paid experts.

## Aesopianism Again

The only evidence, if it can be called that, was Gold's appearance in May Day parades in 1951 and 1952, and the fact that he was several times mentioned without abuse by the *Daily Worker* after his resignation. From these scant strands, the government wove a tenuous net based on expert testimony about Aesopian language, etc.

Gold for 30 years had been an avowed member of the Communist party. On resigning, Gold made it clear that he was not abandoning his beliefs. The Taft-Hartley affidavit requires a Communist labor leader to give up beliefs as well as membership but the government did not indict him under the "belief" provision, probably because the Supreme Court has never been able to muster a majority for its constitutionality. Only the oath as to membership has been upheld.

Apparently the government was afraid that it could not at a new trial get a conviction on the membership clause and make it stick. The Court of Appeals here split 4-4 on the previous conviction; the Supreme Court threw it out on the ground that the FBI had tampered with the jury.

### Other Encouraging Decisions

**In addition to the 6-2 decision by the Supreme Court ordering a new trial for three persons convicted of harboring a Smith Act fugitive and the Court's agreement to hear John M. Harmon 3rd's appeal from an Army security discharge, there was another bit of encouraging court news here in Washington which went unnoticed.**

**Judge Prettyman, perhaps the single most influential reactionary judge on the Court of Appeals in this country, filed a dissenting opinion in suits brought by two American Lithuanian Associations against "listing" by the Attorney General.**

**This dissent dealt with the interrogatories Mr. Brownell sends out to organizations which ask him for a hearing before listing. Judge Prettyman's dissent is the most acidly devastating analysis of these interrogatories to come from any judge. He said the questions asked were "impossible to answer" and the proffer of a hearing based on answering them "was a nullity."**

## The Same Old Informers

The only judge on the Court of Appeals to write an opinion, Bazelon, had been scathing in analyzing the character of the evidence offered by the prosecution. That opinion must have raised the question of whether it would be wise to use the same type of testimony at a new trial. The government apparently had no other, since it decided to throw in the sponge instead.

Another inhibiting factor may have been the growing hostility of the Supreme Court where there is evidence that the testimony of the government's paid "experts" is tainted by perjury. Of the seven ex-Communist witnesses in the Gold trial, six make their living by testifying, lecturing, writing or "consulting," and one—Manning Johnson—has been proved a liar so often (notably in the case of Ralph Bunche) that the Department of Justice may have blanched at the thought of trotting him out again in this better atmosphere.

***If You Like This Issue, Let Us Send A Sample Copy to A Friend***

**I. F. Stone's Weekly,** 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

**Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:***

**Name** .....

**Street** .....

**City** .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

**Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:**

**(To) Name** .....

5/20/57

**Street** .....

**City** .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

**Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐**

*I. F. Stone's Weekly*
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C.
An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED